Charged Higgs Discovery in the W plus "Dark" Vector Boson Decay Mode

Hooman Davoudiasl *,[1] William J. Marciano †,[1] Raymundo Ramos ‡,[2] and Marc Sher §[2]

[1]*Department of Physics, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, NY 11973, USA*
[2]*High Energy Theory Group, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23187, USA*

In Two Higgs doublet extensions of the Standard Model, flavor-changing neutral current constraints can be addressed by introducing a $U(1)'$ gauge symmetry, under which the Higgs doublets carry different charges. That scenario implies the presence of a $H^\pm W^\mp Z'$ vertex at tree level. For the light "dark" Z model ($Z' = Z_d$) with $m_{Z_d} < 10$ GeV, such a coupling leads to the dominant decay mode $H^\pm \to W^\pm + Z_d$ (for $m_{H^\pm} \lesssim 175$ GeV), rather than the usual type I model decay $H^\pm \to \tau^\pm \nu$, for a broad range of parameters. We find that current analyses do not place significant bounds on this scenario. Over much of the parameter space considered, the decay of a pair-produced t ($\bar{t}$) into $H^+ b$ ($H^- \bar{b}$) provides the dominant $H^\pm$ production. Analysis of available LHC data can likely cover significant ranges of our parameters, if $Z_d \to \mu^+\mu^-$ has a branching ratio of $\sim 20\%$. If the Z_d decays mainly invisibly then probing the entire relevant parameter space would likely require additional data from future LHC runs. We briefly discuss the phenomenology for $m_{H^\pm} \gtrsim 175$ GeV.

arXiv:1401.2164v2 [hep-ph] 17 Jan 2014

Discovery of the neutral Higgs scalar boson h, with mass $m_h \simeq 126$ GeV [1, 2], completes the $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ Standard Model (SM) elementary particle spectrum. So far, the observed properties of the Higgs support the minimal paradigm of electroweak symmetry breaking and mass generation via a single complex fundamental $SU(2)_L$ Higgs doublet, ϕ, with vacuum expectation value $\langle\phi\rangle = v/\sqrt{2}$, where $v \simeq 246$ GeV. Nevertheless, outstanding questions, such as the nature of dark matter (DM), origin of baryogenesis, and disparity of fermion masses remain and suggest the likelihood of additional "new physics" beyond SM expectations.

Among the simplest extensions of the SM are: *(1)* Introduction of a second Higgs doublet ϕ_2 with $\langle\phi_2\rangle = v_2/\sqrt{2}$ which in tandem with $\langle\phi_1\rangle = v_1/\sqrt{2}$ breaks the $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ symmetry (with $v = \sqrt{v_1^2 + v_2^2} \simeq 246$ GeV) and gives rise to a SM like h, as well as additional physical scalars H, A, and $H^\pm$ (yet to be observed). *(2)* Appendage of an extra $U(1)'$ local gauge symmetry broken by a complex singlet scalar field ϕ_s, which gives mass to its associated spin-1 gauge boson Z' and introduces an additional scalar H_s. Discovery of a Z' or additional scalar particles would fundamentally revolutionize particle physics.

In this paper, we consider a combination of the two "new physics" scenarios mentioned above, which form a natural complement to the SM. Two Higgs doublets ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 with different $U(1)'$ gauge charges are introduced. The $U(1)'$ symmetry is utilized [3] to prevent the occurrence of tree level flavor-changing neutral currents [4]. A singlet ϕ_s is also introduced to give mass to the Z'. Here, ϕ_2 and all other SM particles are assumed to have zero $U(1)'$ charge (this matches the conventional definition, in which ϕ_2 couples to the top quark [5, 6]) and hence all SM fermions only couple to ϕ_2 (which acts very much like the conventional SM Higgs doublet). However, ϕ_1 and ϕ_s $U(1)'$ charges are non-vanishing. This type of scenario is classified as a type I 2-Higgs doublet model (2HDM). To agree with constraints from ΔM_{B_d} (see, for example, Ref. [7]), requires $v_2 \gtrsim v_1$

Extra $U(1)'$ 2HDMs have been considered in the past for heavy Z' bosons [8]. The novelty of our approach is that we assume the Z' is relatively light; $m_{Z'} \lesssim 10$ GeV. (Generalization of our results to higher masses is straightforward.) Such a scenario is often associated with "dark" photon models in which $U(1)' = U(1)_d$ and $Z' = \gamma_d$ (the dark photon), a gauge symmetry connected with generic DM or a hidden sector that is otherwise decoupled from the SM. Dark photons which kinetically mix with ordinary photons, parametrized by $\varepsilon \ll 1$, and acquire small induced couplings to our world [9] have been suggested in response to various astrophysical puzzles [10], as well as an explanation for the muon anomalous magnetic moment ($g_\mu - 2$) discrepancy between theory and experiment [11, 12].

With an extra doublet, ϕ_1, carrying $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ as well as $U(1)_d$ charges, the SM Z and γ_d will undergo mass mixing with a small mixing parameter ε_Z, constrained by electroweak phenomenology. This setup results in the observed Z and a light "dark" $Z = Z_d$ [3], where

$$\varepsilon_Z \simeq \frac{m_{Z_d}}{m_Z} \cos\beta \, \cos\beta_d \,. \tag{1}$$

One finds

$$m_Z \simeq \frac{g}{2\cos\theta_W} \sqrt{v_1^2 + v_2^2} \simeq 91 \text{ GeV} \tag{2}$$

and

$$m_{Z_d} \simeq g_d \, Q_d \, \sqrt{v_d^2 + v_1^2} \lesssim 10 \text{ GeV} \,, \tag{3}$$

*email: hooman@bnl.gov
†email: marciano@bnl.gov
‡email: raramos@email.wm.edu
§email: mtsher@wm.edu

where g and g_d are, respectively, $SU(2)_L$ and $U(1)_d$ gauge couplings, Q_d is the dark charge of ϕ_s and ϕ_1; $\langle\phi_s\rangle = v_d/\sqrt{2}$. The convention used here

$$\tan\beta = v_2/v_1 \qquad ; \qquad \tan\beta_d = v_d/v_1 \tag{4}$$

is inverted relative to Ref. [3], where the model was first introduced, in keeping with the more standard 2HDM convention [5, 6].

The "dark" Z gives rise to interesting particle physics phenomenology such as "dark" parity violation [13], rare meson decays $K \to \pi Z_d$ and $B \to K Z_d$ (phase space permitting) and even $h \to Z Z_d$. Constraints from these phenomena lead (very roughly and rather strongly dependent on m_{Z_d}) to [3]

$$\cos\beta\, \cos\beta_d \lesssim 10^{-2}\,. \tag{5}$$

One can always go to zero mixing via $v_1 \to 0$ and essentially decouple the effect of Z_d.

Given the above considerations, for our subsequent discussion, we will allow

$$5 \lesssim \tan\beta \lesssim 20 \qquad ; \qquad 5 \lesssim \tan\beta_d \lesssim 20 \tag{6}$$

and charged Higgs masses

$$100\ \text{GeV} \lesssim m_{H^\pm} \lesssim 175\ \text{GeV} \tag{7}$$

as acceptable and interesting parts of parameter space. Larger values of $\tan\beta$ and $\tan\beta_d$ are allowed, but may require fine-tuning to avoid problems with unitarity (see Appendix A of Ref. [6] for a discussion and references) and perturbation theory [14]. Later, we will briefly discuss aspects of phenomenology for $m_{H^\pm} \gtrsim 175$ GeV. We will mainly consider $m_{Z_d} \lesssim 10$ GeV (larger m_{Z_d} values are, of course, possible, but would have phase space effects on the predictions below). For ranges of $\tan\beta$ and $\tan\beta_d$ in Eq. (6), we would typically expect $v_d \gtrsim 100$ GeV and hence it is implicitly assumed that $g_d \times Q_d \lesssim 0.1$.

To highlight the main new point of this paper, we note that for any number of $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ Higgs doublets and singlets in the extended SM, there is no $H^\pm W^\mp Z$ vertex at tree level. Similarly, if all doublets had the same $U(1)'$ couplings there would be no tree level $H^\pm W^\mp Z'$ vertex. However, since in the "dark" Z model the doublets have different $U(1)_d$ charges, $Q_d(\phi_2) = 0$ and (for definiteness) $Q_d(\phi_1) = Q_d(\phi_s) = 1$, there will be a tree level $H^\pm W^\mp Z_d$ vertex induced by the kinetic covariant derivative Lagrangian term $|D_\mu\phi_1|^2$, with

$$D_\mu = \partial_\mu + ig\frac{\tau^a}{2}W^a_\mu + i\frac{g'}{2}B_\mu + ig_d Z_{d\mu}\,, \tag{8}$$

where τ^a, $a = 1, 2, 3$, are Pauli matrices, W^a_μ are $SU(2)_L$ gauge fields, and g' and B_μ are the coupling constant and gauge field of $U(1)_Y$, respectively. One finds a $H^\pm W^\mp Z_d$ coupling given by

$$\pm\, i\, g\, m_{Z_d} \sin\beta\, \cos\beta_d\, g_{\mu\nu}. \tag{9}$$

The m_{Z_d} dependence in (9) is cancelled by a $1/m_{Z_d}$ factor when the longitudinal Z_d is involved. Hence, the only real suppression in that case comes from $\cos\beta_d \lesssim 0.2$.

The coupling in Eq. (9) leads to the $H^\pm$ decay rate (neglecting m_{Z_d} phase space effects)

$$\Gamma(H^\pm \to W^\pm Z_d) = \frac{g^2}{64\pi}\frac{m^3_{H^\pm}}{m^2_W}(\sin\beta\, \cos\beta_d)^2 \left(1 - \frac{m^2_W}{m^2_{H^\pm}}\right)^3 . \tag{10}$$

That is to be compared with the primary fermionic decay (for $m_{H^\pm} \lesssim 175$ GeV)

$$\Gamma(H^\pm \to \tau^\pm\nu) = \frac{g^2}{32\pi} m_{H^\pm}\frac{m^2_\tau}{m^2_W}\cot^2\beta \left(1 - \frac{m^2_\tau}{m^2_{H^\pm}}\right)^2 , \tag{11}$$

which is suppressed by $\cot^2\beta$ for the type I 2HDM, as well as the small m^2_τ/m^2_W factor.

The result in Eq. (10) can also be simply derived in the limit $m_{H^\pm} \gg m_W, m_{Z_d}$ using the Goldstone boson equivalence theorem, from the $H^\pm G^\mp a^0$ coupling $\pm g \sin\beta \cos\beta_d\, m^2_{H^\pm}/(2m_W)$, where $G^\pm$ and a^0 correspond to the Goldstone bosons that become longitudinal components of the $W^\pm$ and Z_d. That computation confirms Eq. (10) and provides a nice check on the normalization of our result.

For the ratio $R \equiv \Gamma(H^\pm \to W^\pm Z_d)/\Gamma(H^\pm \to \tau^\pm\nu)$, one finds

$$R \simeq \frac{1}{2}\frac{m^2_{H^\pm}}{m^2_\tau}\frac{\sin^4\beta}{\cos^2\beta}\cos^2\beta_d \left(1 - \frac{m^2_W}{m^2_{H^\pm}}\right)^3 . \tag{12}$$

Over the parameter space in Eq. (6) and Eq. (7), $R \gtrsim 1$ and the decay channel $H^\pm \to W^\pm Z_d$ has a dominant branching ratio near 1, *i.e.* nearly all $H^\pm$ produced will give rise to $W^\pm\, Z_d$ final states. Here, we have implicitly assumed that all neutral scalars present in our 2HDM framework are heavier than $\Delta m = m_{H^\pm} - m^\pm_W$ and hence on-shell decays of the type $H^\pm \to W^\pm +$ scalar are kinematically forbidden. Note that for the mass range (7), $\Delta m \lesssim 95$ GeV, which can be readily accommodated for a general scalar potential, including terms proportional to $\phi_s\phi_1^\dagger\phi_2$ [8]. Hence, the significance of $H^\pm \to W^\pm Z_d$ in our framework is quite general. (Ref. [15] considers $H^\pm \to W^+ +$ invisible scalar in a different model. If our model contains light scalars, $H^\pm \to W^\pm +$ scalar can have a significant branching fraction, potentially leading to a $W^+W^- + 4\, Z_d$ signature, which has been discussed in Ref. [16]. For a discussion of $H^\pm \to W^+ +$ pseudo scalar, see Ref. [17].)

Since $H^+ \to W^+ Z_d$ can be the dominant decay for reasonable values of the parameters, we now focus on its detection prospects. Detection strategies differ depending on whether the Z_d decays visibly or invisibly. Often, it is assumed that the Z_d decays will be exclusively to charged states if kinetic mixing dominates, but could also have a non-negligible rate into neutrinos if mass-mixing is dominant [3]. However, if the Z_d is the mediator of a force among light dark matter particles its decays are then expected to be largely into invisible dark matter states (this possibility could potentially be further probed at low energy fixed target experiments [18, 19]).

The partial decay widths of the Z_d are given, assuming only kinetic and mass matrix mixing, by [3]

$$\Gamma(Z_d \to f\bar{f}) \simeq \frac{N_C}{48\pi}\left(\frac{\varepsilon_Z\, g}{\cos\theta_W}\right)^2 \left(g'^2_{Vf} + g^2_{Af}\right) m_{Z_d}, \quad (13)$$

where fermion masses have been ignored, $N_C = 3$ (1) for quarks (leptons), $g_{Af} \equiv -T_{3f}$, and $g'_{Vf} \equiv T_{3f} - 2Q_f[\sin^2\theta_W - (\varepsilon/\varepsilon_Z)\cos\theta_W \sin\theta_W]$. For m_{Z_d} in the range of interest here, fermion masses and hadronic contributions can be significant. Dark photons decay with individual leptonic branching fractions of 10%-40% are expected over our m_{Z_d} range. The branching fractions for Z_d will be different and have dependence on $\varepsilon/\varepsilon_Z$. In what follows, for concreteness, we will assume a branching fraction into $\mu^+\mu^-$ of 20%. There may also be a significant invisible rate for decay into neutrinos. We will next consider various production modes for the charged Higgs states.

Single production from light fermion initial states is negligible, since in a type I 2HDM in which $\tan\beta$ is not small, the $H^\pm$ couplings to light fermions are quite suppressed. However, over a significant portion of the ranges in Eq. (6) and Eq. (7), single production of $H^\pm$ from the decay of a pair produced top or anti-top dominates. To see this, note that the ratio $r_t \equiv \Gamma(t \to H^+ b)/\Gamma(t \to W^+ b)$ is given by [5]

$$r_t \simeq \frac{(1-\mu^2_{H^\pm})^2}{(1-\mu^2_W)}\cot^2\beta\,, \quad (14)$$

where $\mu_i \equiv m_i/m_t$. For example, if $m_{H^\pm} = 120$ GeV and $\tan\beta = 5$, we have $r_t \simeq 0.01$. Given that the $t\bar{t}$ production cross section at the 8 TeV LHC is ~ 200 pb [20], we find a single H^+ cross section, from $t \to H^+ b$, of about 2 pb. Hence, the single production cross section of a charged Higgs, from a $t\bar{t}$ pair, is about 4 pb. For $m_{H^\pm} = 160$ GeV, $r_t \simeq 10^{-3}$, which would yield ~ 0.4 pb. We can compare these to other production modes.

The process $b\,g \to t\,H^-$ is a significant production mode for a single charged Higgs [21, 22] at the LHC. For example, from Ref. [22] (after adapting their results to a type I 2HDM) we find that for $\tan\beta = 10$ (typical of our parameter space), the single production of a ~ 160 GeV charged Higgs has a cross section of ~ 20 (100) fb at 8 (14) TeV LHC (the cross section scales as $\tan^{-2}\beta$).

Drell-Yan processes provide another production mode at the LHC. A recent calculation of the Drell-Yan cross section for H^+H^-, through a photon or a Z, has been provided in Ref. [23]. As $m_{H^\pm}$ is increased from ~ 100 GeV to ~ 175 GeV, $\sigma_{\rm prod}$ decreases from ~ 50 fb to ~ 5 fb at the 8 TeV LHC; at 14 TeV the cross section is roughly twice as large. We see that the associated $tH^\pm$ production is a factor of $\sim 4-10$ larger than the Drell-Yan cross sections for a similar mass. (The Drell-Yan and associated production only become comparable for $\tan\beta$ near 20. However, note that Drell-Yan production has negligible model dependence.) Hence, single $H^\pm$ production from $t\bar{t}$ is quite dominant. However, H^+H^- production from top pairs, for $\tan\beta = 5$, has a cross section $\sim r_t^2 \times 200$ pb $\sim 0.2-20$ fb at 8 TeV, and is subdominant to Drell-Yan production over most of the relevant parameter space.

Given the large cross section for single production of $H^\pm$ from $t\bar{t}$ pairs, a careful study of this mode is warranted [24]. A simple estimate from our preceding discussion suggests that the 8 TeV LHC data, with ~ 20 fb^{-1}, contains $\sim 10^4 - 10^5$ single charged Higgs events. The final state here, $W^+W^-b\,\bar{b}\,Z_d$, will resemble that from $t\bar{t}$ production, but with the addition of a Z_d. For $Z_d \to \mu^+\mu^-$, if the background can be brought under control for $\mu^+\mu^-$ invariant masses below ~ 10 GeV, the existing data would likely probe much of the parameter space.

However, if the Z_d decays invisibly, the search will likely be more challenging and depend on how well the missing energy signal can be separated from the background. An approximate bound on this mode can be inferred from the ATLAS [25] and CMS [26] bounds on stop pair, $\tilde{t}\tilde{t}^*$, production followed by $\tilde{t} \to t\,\xi^0$, where ξ^0 is a neutralino. The final state here will be $W^+W^-b\,\bar{b}+$ missing energy, which is the same as single production of $H^\pm$ (from $t\bar{t}$) followed by decay into W and invisible Z_d (though $\tilde{t}\tilde{t}^*$ has typically more symmetric missing energy in the event). For neutralino masses of ~ 50 GeV, these experiments find bounds of ~ 2 pb for a stop mass of ~ 250 GeV, which seems to constrain only the lower part of the mass range (7). We expect that a more detailed analysis, or additional data from the next run of the LHC, can probe the missing energy signal in single $H^\pm$ production over a significant part of our parameter space.

In the mass range (7), most charged Higgs bosons will decay into a W and a Z_d. The subsequent decay of Z_d will then yield a collimated pair of muons, with a probability of roughly 20%. The ATLAS collaboration [27] has explicitly searched for prompt muon lepton "jets" (highly collimated lepton pairs) in their 2011 data (5 fb^{-1} at 7 TeV). In one analysis, they search for two muon "lepton jets" and the rest of the events are ignored. An upper

bound on the cross section, with mild variations over the sub-GeV range of m_{Z_d}, of approximately 18 fb is found (we note in passing that, in this ATLAS analysis, the electron-jet data agree well with expectations, however the muon-jet data show a mild excess [27]).

From the preceding discussion, the Drell-Yan H^+H^- cross section σ_{prod} will dominate the 2 Z_d production. We will denote the branching ratio for $H^+ \to W^+Z_d$, as calculated above, by B_{HWZ_d}. Also, let $B_{Z_d\mu\mu}$ be the branching fraction for $Z_d \to \mu^+\mu^-$, assumed to be 20%. The rate for production of W^+W^- and two $\mu^+\mu^-$ pairs is then given by

$$\sigma_{\rm prod}\, B^2_{HWZ_d} B^2_{Z_d\mu\mu}\,. \tag{15}$$

For $B_{HWZ_d} = 1$, as illustrated above over much of the parameter-space, and for $B_{Z\mu\mu} \sim 0.2$, we find (for $m_{H^\pm}$ near 100 GeV) that the production rate for W^+W^- with two muon pairs is about ~ 2 fb. Even allowing for uncertainties, the aforementioned ATLAS bound [27] is still well above the range expected in our framework. However, the ATLAS analysis ignores the rest of the event, and the distinct signature in our model contains an additional W^+W^- pair. An analysis focused on our particular signature (including its two-body kinematics), using ~ 20 fb^{-1} of 8 TeV data collected in 2012, would presumably result in an improved bound that will be closer to our expected Drell-Yan signal rate.

Let us now briefly address the regime $m_{H^\pm} \gtrsim 175$ GeV, where $H^+ \to t\,b$ can become important. Nonetheless, for $\tan\beta \sim \tan\beta_d$, the $H^\pm \to W^\pm Z_d$ mode will remain significant assuming, as before, two body $H^\pm \to W^\pm +$ scalar (perhaps except for the SM-like Higgs at 126 GeV) is not kinematically allowed. Hence, one may typically expect $\mathcal{O}(1)$ branching fraction into $W^\pm\, Z_d$, depending on the 2HDM parameters. In this regime of $m_{H^\pm}$, single $H^\pm$ production from top pairs, discussed above, will not be important. However, single production through $b\,g \to H^-\,t$ can be quite important in this case [21, 22]. The current 8 TeV data could typically contain $\mathcal{O}(100)$ $b\,g \to H^-\,t$ events and the next run of the LHC (at 14 TeV) can potentially yield several thousand more. A significant fraction of events in this final state can be expected to yield $t\,W^-\,Z_d$ which has an extra dilepton or excess missing energy (depending on the Z_d decay), compared to single top production in the SM. In case of $H^- \to \bar{t}\,b$ dominance, these events contain extra b jets compared to $t\bar{t}$ events, but the large top pair (including $t\bar{t}\,b\bar{b}$) background could pose a challenge for detection of the new physics.

Before closing, we would like to add that there are also HZZ_d and hZZ_d couplings, which will lead to interesting decays of both the light and heavy Higgs, with rates comparable to Eq. (10), but depending on scalar mixing angles. The phenomenology of the hZZ_d decays has been discussed in Ref. [28] in the limit in which mixing between the h and H is ignored. Including the 2 Higgs doublet mixing angle α, we have found that the hZZ_d vertex is the same as in Ref. [28] where $\cos\beta$ is replaced by $\sin\beta\cos(\beta-\alpha)$. For large $\tan\beta$ and small α, these coincide. The HZZ_d vertex is given by the hZZ_d coupling with a replacement of $\cos(\beta-\alpha)$ with $-\sin(\beta-\alpha)$ (for collider phenomenology of alternative dark Z' models, see for example Ref. [29]).

In conclusion, we have considered a type I 2HDM extension of the SM, where one of the doublets carries a charge under a "dark" $U(1)_d$ gauge symmetry. The $U(1)_d$ is well-motivated in this context, as it forbids large flavor-changing neutral current effects that would violate precision flavor bounds. The vector boson associated with this symmetry, Z_d, is assumed to be light, and may be relevant in explaining certain astrophysical signals ascribed to dark matter or the $g_\mu - 2$ anomaly. We show that in this realization of *type I* 2HDM, for charged Higgs masses in the range $\sim$ 100-175 GeV the decay mode $H^\pm \to W^\pm Z_d$ dominates over the conventional $H^\pm \to \tau^\pm\nu$ mode, for a wide range of interesting parameters. The single production of $H^\pm$, from a top quark decay in a $t\bar{t}$ final state, is dominant and could potentially cover much of the parameter space with currently available data, if the Z_d decays into muon pairs $\sim 20\%$ of the time. In case of an invisibly decaying Z_d, the current bounds suggest more data is required to access significant parts of the parameter space. For $m_{H^\pm} \gtrsim 175$ GeV, single production of $H^\pm$ from $t\bar{t}$ pairs is suppressed, however single production via $b\,g \to H^-\,t$ can provide sizeable statistics. The next run of the LHC at 14 TeV can have significant reach for the discovery of $H^\pm$ in the $W^\pm\,Z_d$ mode.

We thank H.-S. Lee for discussions. The work of H.D. and W.J.M. is supported by the US Department of Energy under Grant Contract DE-AC02-98CH10886. The work of R.R. and M.S. is supported by the NSF under Grant No. PHY-1068008. The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the authors, and do not represent the National Science Foundation.

[1] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 1 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex]].
[2] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 30 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex]].
[3] H. Davoudiasl, H. -S. Lee and W. J. Marciano, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 115019 (2012) [arXiv:1203.2947 [hep-ph]].
[4] S. L. Glashow and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 1958 (1977).
[5] J. F. Gunion, H. E. Haber, G. L. Kane and S. Dawson, "The Higgs Hunter's Guide," Front. Phys. **80**, 1 (2000).
[6] G. C. Branco, P. M. Ferreira, L. Lavoura, M. N. Rebelo, M. Sher and J. P. Silva, Phys. Rept. **516**, 1 (2012) [arXiv:1106.0034 [hep-ph]].
[7] C. -Y. Chen and S. Dawson, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 5, 055016 (2013) [arXiv:1301.0309 [hep-ph]].

[8] J. F. Gunion, L. Roszkowski and H. E. Haber, Phys. Lett. B **189**, 409 (1987); H. E. Haber and M. Sher, Phys. Rev. D **35**, 2206 (1987); H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Lett. B **387**, 341 (1996) [hep-ph/9607202]. For recent work in this direction, see P. Ko, Y. Omura and C. Yu, Phys. Lett. B **717**, 202 (2012) [arXiv:1204.4588 [hep-ph]]; P. Ko, Y. Omura and C. Yu, arXiv:1309.7156 [hep-ph].
[9] B. Holdom, Phys. Lett. B **166**, 196 (1986).
[10] N. Arkani-Hamed, D. P. Finkbeiner, T. R. Slatyer and N. Weiner, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 015014 (2009) [arXiv:0810.0713 [hep-ph]].
[11] P. Fayet, Nucl. Phys. B **347**, 743 (1990).
[12] M. Pospelov, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 095002 (2009) [arXiv:0811.1030 [hep-ph]].
[13] H. Davoudiasl, H. -S. Lee and W. J. Marciano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 031802 (2012) [arXiv:1205.2709 [hep-ph]].
[14] C. -Y. Chen, S. Dawson and M. Sher, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 015018 (2013) [arXiv:1305.1624 [hep-ph]].
[15] U. Maitra, B. Mukhopadhyaya, S. Nandi, S. K. Rai and A. Shivaji, arXiv:1401.1775 [hep-ph].
[16] H. -S. Lee and M. Sher, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 115009 (2013) [arXiv:1303.6653 [hep-ph]].
[17] R. Dermisek, J. P. Hall, E. Lunghi and S. Shin, arXiv:1311.7208 [hep-ph].
[18] B. Batell, M. Pospelov and A. Ritz, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 095024 (2009) [arXiv:0906.5614 [hep-ph]]; P. deNiverville, M. Pospelov and A. Ritz, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 075020 (2011) [arXiv:1107.4580 [hep-ph]]; P. deNiverville, D. McKeen and A. Ritz, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 035022 (2012) [arXiv:1205.3499 [hep-ph]]; R. Dharmapalan *et al.* [MiniBooNE Collaboration], arXiv:1211.2258 [hep-ex].
[19] E. Izaguirre, G. Krnjaic, P. Schuster and N. Toro, arXiv:1307.6554 [hep-ph]; M. D. Diamond and P. Schuster, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 221803 (2013) [arXiv:1307.6861 [hep-ph]].
[20] A. Calderon [ATLAS and CMS Collaborations], arXiv:1301.1158 [hep-ex].
[21] M. Klasen, K. Kovarik, P. Nason and C. Weydert, Eur. Phys. J. C **72**, 2088 (2012) [arXiv:1203.1341 [hep-ph]].
[22] X. Gong, Z. -G. Si, S. Yang and Y. -j. Zheng, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 3, 035014 (2013) [arXiv:1210.7822 [hep-ph]].
[23] R. Enberg, J. Rathsman and G. Wouda, arXiv:1311.4367 [hep-ph].
[24] H.-S. Lee, private communication and work in progress with K. Kong and M. Park.
[25] [ATLAS Collaboration], ATLAS-CONF-2013-037.
[26] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **73**, 2677 (2013) [arXiv:1308.1586 [hep-ex]].
[27] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **719**, 299 (2013) [arXiv:1212.5409].
[28] H. Davoudiasl, H. -S. Lee, I. Lewis and W. J. Marciano, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 015022 (2013) [arXiv:1304.4935 [hep-ph]].
[29] A. Alves, S. Profumo and F. S. Queiroz, arXiv:1312.5281 [hep-ph].